## Christopher, Anne

**From:** Christopher, Anne
**Sent:** Thursday, October 09, 2014 5:05 PM
**To:** Horwitz, Benjamin; Contreras, Peter
**Subject:** RE: Soldotna Y Chevron UST Closure Assessment - Status Report

Peter,
See the email that Ben forwarded below.

Mark Rozak's response to the ESA is due 10/27/14, so he has about 2 weeks. I agree that this might complicate things, but at least it proves to him why it is so important for him to monitor his tanks and piping. I guess we will have to wait and see for the next 2 weeks and then decide what to do if he doesn't respond or doesn't accept our offer.

Annie

**From:** Horwitz, Benjamin
**Sent:** Thursday, October 09, 2014 8:49 AM
**To:** Christopher, Anne
**Subject:** FW: Soldotna Y Chevron UST Closure Assessment - Status Report

Things are getting worse at Soldotna Y Chevron. They found significant contamination while removing the piping that had been abandoned. I am conflicted because I still have my doubts about the authority ADEC has to require the pipe removal and sampling....but if ADEC hadn't required it none of this would have been discovered. I also wonder if this is going to somehow impact his response to the ESA.

**From:** Brinkerhoff, Larry D (DEC) [mailto:larry.brinkerhoff@alaska.gov]
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 08, 2014 4:58 PM
**To:** Paige, Cheryl E (DEC); Steele, William E (DEC)
**Cc:** Horwitz, Benjamin
**Subject:** FW: Soldotna Y Chevron UST Closure Assessment - Status Report

FYI...below is an update from Paul Horwath with CSP on Soldotna Y Chevron...he was out there on site yesterday and today.

Larry Brinkerhoff
UST Prevention Manager
Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation
555 Cordova St
Anchorage, AK 99501
907-269-3055 (Phone)
907-269-7687 (Fax)

UST Web Page:
http://dec.alaska.gov/spar/ipp/tanks.htm

**From:** Horwath, Paul D (DEC)
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 08, 2014 3:48 PM
**To:** Weimer, Robert M (DEC)

**Cc:** Brinkerhoff, Larry D (DEC); Horwath, Paul D (DEC); Oconnell, Bill A (DEC)
**Subject:** Soldotna Y Chevron UST Closure Assessment - Status Report

Robert,
I inspected the UST closure work at this gas station both yesterday and today. Here's what's transpired, and what's been discovered:

The fuel lines have been physically removed from the ground.

Two locations of gasoline contaminated soil have been identified:

1) High concentrations of gasoline contamination in soil are present under the location of a former dispenser. The contamination continued to the maximum depth explored (~7.5' bgs). PID readings exceeded the maximum value PID meter (>9,999 units). Gasoline odors are obvious.
2) A lesser concentration of gasoline contamination was encountered in a tank sump at the top of one of the gasoline USTs. PID reading in the 3,000 units range.

One location of diesel fuel contamination was located in a tank sump at the top of one of the underground fuel tanks. PID reading was ~33 units.

This UST facility is now officially a LUST site. The existing fuel tank area and the former dispenser island area will both require release investigation and corrective action.

I advised the owner/operator (Mark Rozak) and the "qualified person" (Arnie Tikka) to perform no more than the minimal sampling requirements to satisfy the IPP required UST dispenser & piping closure assessment sampling at this time. Mr. Rozak says he's budgeted out for time being. The scope of future release investigation sampling requirements will greatly supersede the minimal requirements for UST dispenser/piping closure assessment. I see no need to sample the contaminated soil stockpile at this time. A soil sample from the bottom of the exploratory test hole was collected for lab analysis. This soil sample also represents the contaminated soil that's been stockpiled on site. There's a much larger quantity of contaminated soil remaining in the ground than has been excavated and stockpiled. There's no reason to increase sampling costs by addressing sampling requirements in a piecemeal fashion. We can impose soil and GW sampling requirements in a more comprehensive manner, and more cost effectively, during future release investigation and corrective action work. From what I observed, and based on prior sites and experiences, the gasoline contamination from the former dispenser will likely extend down, and into, groundwater.

The site soils are sands and gravels with very low fines content. In-situ soil treatment will be an effective, and cost efficient means of treatment for the gasoline impacted soils. In-situ soil treatment was implemented successfully at this site during the 1990s, to remediate an estimated 300cy of gasoline contaminate soil.

Approximately 12cy of contaminated soil has been stockpiled.

Mr. Rozak asked me about the pollution liability insurance policy he has for his gas station. I told him I don't deal with those policies and don't know much about them.

There's the update.

Paul Horwath
262-3422